

## **LESSONS LEARNED – 100 AREA END-STATES WORKSHOP**

Participant Comments – June 23 – 24, 2004

### **PARTICIPATION – DEMOGRAPHICS**

1. Need to attract a broader slice of the public – evening meetings would help

### **TRIBES**

2. Encourage tribal participation, Each Tribe is separate, this does not replace Government to Government consultation for the Tribes.
3. These presentations should be given to Tribal governments at the board level. The Tribal government is not part of the “public” level of discussion. For example, if Office of Legacy Management gains responsibility of the land and the Tribes desires it, these discussions are mute [sic].
4. I was uncomfortable with the strong emphasis that seemed to be given to Tribal Nations demands and desires, which sounded to me like an attempt to discredit and exclude all other members of the public.

### **INVITATION LETTER**

5. Letter on workshop did not accurately represent the purpose.

### **MEETING FORMAT AND FACILITATION**

6. Generally positive – lots of suggestions for improvement

### **INFORMATION NEEDS**

7. Make all materials presented available ahead of time and in hard copy during session.
8. Point the public to the huge amount of info available about the Hanford Site prior to the workshop!
9. The agenda should include the focused questions.

### **MEETING PROCESS**

10. Provide more time for first session to take time to get to know the group.
11. The goal seemed more to provide the end vision for the Hanford Site. Many assumptions are embedded in the presentations and they should be brought out.
12. Asking for public opinion on technical decisions when analysis is not complete is unwise.
13. Good to hear both sides of each presentation, pro-con (to make informed decision).
14. More time could be given on how technical material was derived.

15. Lost questions and focus on input to reasonably foreseeable maximum exposure scenarios. Did not even explain them and how they differ from land-use, end-state.
16. Kept trying to inappropriately get comments on final engineering or institutional control (i.e. take out pipeline, leave reactors) without any risk basis for discussion & failure to have people at front who understood wrong emphasis.
17. Tell the group ahead of time whether the comments are final or not, i.e., we'll get another swipe at it with the CERCLA process, ROD process, therefore your thinking is 'possibility thinking' How would you like to see it?

### **200 AREA / FUTURE WORKSHOPS**

18. The 200 Area will be geometrically more complex. Make sure the representation in the shaping committee of this workshop is diverse.
19. Characterize questions for 200A – narrow to upcoming decisions and use future workshops to expand.
20. Where is the 400 Area? We have/will discuss 100, 200 & 300 Areas.

### **AGENCY PARTICIPATION**

21. TPA agencies involvement was imperative for credibility.
22. Provide list of key decisions makers for Tri-Parties.
23. Good general introduction, good specific explanations in each session, good representation from agencies and USFW.
24. Agency reps often seemed to dominate discussion and distillation of results so their views were (perhaps inaccurately) represented as the public (generally interpretable as citizen outside the process) view.
25. Agency roles, authorities, responsibilities, accountabilities were not framed at the beginning of the meeting.
26. Appreciated F&WL presentation/presence.

### **USE OF INPUT**

27. Not clear how input will be used

### **MEETING LOGISTICS -- FACILITY**

28. Need cooler rooms – better snacks